



☐ Executive Committee ☒ District Leadership Council ☐ Annual Meeting

**Wisconsin Conservation Congress
Meeting Minutes**

ORDER OF BUSINESS	05/09/2019	2:30 PM	Red Lion Hotel Appleton WI
--------------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by	Larry Bonde at 2:43 PM
----------------------------	------------------------

B. ROLL CALL

ATTENDEES	Joe Weiss, Tony Blattler, Joel Taylor, Dave Larson, Mike Riggle, Steve Budnick, Bob Ellingson, Ronald Krueger Sr, Kevin Smaby, Terry Roehrig, Stan Brownell, Dale Maas, Bob Haase, Brent Weir, Larry Bonde, Dave Breunig, Mike Rogers, Kenneth Risley, Jane Meyer, Scott Gunderson. Kari Lee Zimmerman and Michael Schmidt.
EXCUSED	Eugene Altwies
UNEXCUSED	
GUESTS	

C. Agenda approval or repair

Bonde

DISCUSSION	Larry asked for flexibility in the order of the agenda recognizing staff availabilities and presenters schedules. Terry roaring requested that items D (alternate funding) and J (review of strategic plan) be reversed. Motion by Blattler second by Gunderson to approve agenda as suggested. Motion carried. Secretaries note: items in minutes will be reported as stated on published agenda for clarity. It is understood that the prior approval motion will be followed.
ACTION	

D. Public comments

DISCUSSION	There were no requests made by the public.
ACTION	No action taken.

II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Chairs update

Bonde

DISCUSSION	<p>Larry stated that he was gone for nine days on vacation and thanked Mike Schmidt and Kari Lee Zimmerman for their efforts on the spring hearing process and in the on-line polling report that will be given later. The analysis of the report as you will see later is very detailed and after you have the opportunity to review I'm sure you'll appreciate all the hard work that went into it. He also recognized Natural Resources Board Member Gary Zimmer, Gary was a part of the entire process and Larry wanted to publicly thank him for all the time and effort he put into it. Larry said that tomorrow at the convention he is going to recommend that the committee continue on for at least another year in making suggestions on how to improve the polling process even more.</p> <p>He also stated that he was disappointed with delegates planning for the convention and failure to identify their meal needs per the instruction sheet. It makes it very difficult for the hotel's staff and our liaison help and planning. He asked that the DLC members discuss this at the district meetings to help with the preplanning follow-through. It may not be possible for the hotel to adjust for 100+ meals one or two days before the event.</p> <p>Larry also introduced DNR leadership staff along with natural resource board members that were present and thanked all of them for all their work with the Congress.</p> <p>He commended the Youth Conservation Congress committee for the hard work they put in planning activities for the YCC delegates. This year there will be a youth delegate social-pizza party along with a presentation on musky fishing by Jim Heffner Oneida County. A discussion on the science of bait coloration by Frank Pratt, Sawyer County. They will have the opportunity to create and paint their own sweet musky bait with all the materials provided and also discuss TCC structure and possible summer activities. They will also have the opportunity to sit in and participate during the normal convention process along with a youth delegate field trip for shore fishing with the Neenah High School fishing club and later on tomorrow there will be a breakout session conducted by Ryan Caning, DNR fisheries biologist and Jessica Tomaszewski, University Wisconsin Stevens Point College of Natural Resources Advisor.</p> <p>Larry stated that while they are striving to add additional opportunities for the delegates he also encouraged all WCC delegates to try to drop in to the many social events that are available to the YCC delegates and introduce yourselves and make them feel welcome.</p> <p>Larry also mentioned that WDNR secretary nominee Preston Cole will address the convention tomorrow.</p>
ACTION	Information only. No action taken.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

B. Proposed COP changes

Tony Blattler

DISCUSSION	<p>Tony stated that the only item that will be on the convention floor for a change would be on page 3 in the convention book under the tab quota procedures. It was recommended that the shooting sports committee be made into a permanent committee. He also mentioned that at the next DLC meeting the committee is recommending a change of location of the wording on page 14 section 9 (B.) (2.) To page 6 section (A.) (4.) Again this would be for consideration at the May 24 district leadership Council meeting.</p> <p>Another item that the Rules and Resolutions Committee will be looking at the next time they meet will be the use of the word vote throughout the Code of Procedure, it is felt that the only way we can emphasize that the spring hearings are a pole is if we consistently replace the word vote (when appropriate) and indicate pole. Any of these proposed changes would not come up for DLC review until after Rules and Resolutions Committee has reviewed the issue and made recommendations.</p>	
ACTION	Information only. No action taken.	
	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

C. Spring hearing review

See below

DISCUSSION	See below	
ACTION		
	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

1. DNR fisheries questions

Justine Hasz

DISCUSSION	<p>Justine reported that all of the statewide fisheries management proposed rule changes are proposed to move forward with the exception of question 14. This question: do you favor creating a catch-and-release fishing season during the closed harvest season (January 1 to May 31, assuming the first question is supported) on all Wisconsin Michigan boundary waters? The statewide poll showed 3407/yes 3856/no was approved in 20 counties rejected in 48 counties and tied in 4 counties. She then answered a few questions for clarification and open the discussion for general Fisheries Management questions by DLC members.</p> <p>Dale asked where the department was on the rough fish management team? Justine said many people were aware of some problems they were having with the commercial fishing process as it pertains to rough fish. The department is stopped the bidding process until they can better define the need parameters of the contracts to make them enforceable in the objective of truly reducing the rough fish population and in many inland lakes. She said that the management team is scheduled to meet in December of this year to work on the problem. When asked what she felt her time line was she thought that it would be two years before a plan was presented for review and approval. Dale emphasized that if it was going to take two years for plan approval it was probably going to be three years before any request for bids would actually take place. He questioned whether some of the lakes could go three years without rough fish removal and still sustained a viable game fish population. He urged that the department move this process ahead at a quicker pace since many of the lake districts that utilize rough fish removal are struggling with all the negative effects of rough fish in the system.</p>	
ACTION	Information only. No action taken.	
	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

2. DNR Wildlife Questions

Eric Loebner

DISCUSSION	<p>Eric stated that of the eight State Wildlife Management proposed rule changes all that were supported would be recommended for NRB approval with the exception of question number 7. Question 7: eliminate minimum caliber requirements for pellet guns for hunting certain small game species. Do you favor simplifying weapon regulations by eliminating minimum caliber requirements for pellet guns for hunting hare, rabbit, squirrel, raccoon, fox, coyote, bobcat or unprotected wild animals? Results were 4112/yes 4301/no 45 counties/approved 24/rejected three/tie. He noted the question was supported in the majority of counties but that the department would not recommend advancement.</p>	
ACTION	Information only. No action taken.	
	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

D. Alternative Funding Roundtable and Symposium Update

Terry Roehrig

DISCUSSION	<p>Terry was asked to represent the Wisconsin Conservation Congress at a round table discussion entitled "Alternative Funding for Clean Water and Healthy Soils". This was hosted by the UW Stevens Point College of Natural Resources and UW Extension. Conservation groups represented at the round table were as follows: Ducks Unlimited, Nature Conservancy, Department of</p>	
-------------------	---	--

WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes

Form 8300-026E (R 1/18)

Page 3 of 7

	<p>Natural Resources, Wisconsin Conservation Congress, Gathering Waters, Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts and Letters and UW Stevens Point participants.</p> <p>In their overview they reviewed Wisconsin, Minnesota and Iowa and categorize them as good, bad and ugly for the following reasons:</p> <p>Good Minnesota</p> <p>Minnesota Board of Water and Soil was successful in generating a 3/8 of a cent on sales tax. This resulted in \$600 million generated annually which would be split evenly between 1/3 Clean Water (\$200 million in 2018), 1/3 Outdoor Heritage, 1/3 Arts, Park and Rec, Natural Resources.</p> <p>This was brought forward through a coalition in 2008 that was planned by professionals and implemented and viewed/pitched as a political campaign (it should be recognized that the Minnesota Government structure is different than Wisconsin).</p> <p>Bad Wisconsin</p> <p>in 1997-a coalition was put together for alternative funding by the Wisconsin Conservation Congress and the Stewardship Fund with no positive results.</p> <p>Ugly Iowa</p> <p>is ranked 47th in its lack of conservation funding, in 2006 they started a campaign and still have not increased their funding. This is contributed to political struggles and no backing along with voter struggles and no support.</p> <p>Is it now time for Wisconsin? Topics discussed were: the need for policy changes (budget-dollars allocated to clean water). What are the signals? Public will, fees/taxes and articulation of what the money is for. It was recognized that there needs to be an alignment of circumstances, we are missing key stakeholders such as business, industry and philanthropy.</p> <p>Who else needs to be involved?! Areas suggested were as follows: farmers and their supply chain, food processors, agricultural consultants, local chambers of commerce, local economic development, realtors, tourism, Farm Bureau, healthcare, builders, sports clubs and alliances, land conservations, Green Fire, Indian tribes and public health departments.</p> <p>How do we move forward? Do we focus just on clean water and healthy soils or broader due to scope of panel participants? Can we learn from paper mill cleanup and gas leaks and spill cleanup? We need to target the people of Wisconsin and asked the following questions: what's in it for me? Make it actionable? Make it important to them and get the people involved and brought in. The Round table suggested the next steps: the need to form coalition of groups as of this presentation the Wisconsin Land and Water Group, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation and Gathering Waters have committed to continuing. Terry was asking if the Wisconsin Conservation Congress want to be a part of the coalition.</p> <p>Additional discussion took place with the following action taken.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Motion by Maas second by Meyer that the Wisconsin Conservation Congress be involved in the alternate funding project.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

E. DNR Leadership comments

Scott Loomans

DISCUSSION	<p>Scott thanked the Congress leadership for all the things that they've done and continue to do for conservation in the state. This is the first time he has had the opportunity to address the DLC in his new position as Division Administrator. As Division Administrator this is a very exciting time for him as he goes down the path and wanted to trust that he did not have any preconceived agenda. His assignment is to take the plans in place and make sure that their functioning as intended. CWD will be a hot discussion again this year, there are a lot of different things happening in the field of CWD. The department is working on a new CWD processing center, for those that do not know, we were farming out that testing process and our thoughts were that it was way too expensive operation be performed on the outside so we are in the process of developing our own testing laboratory to expedite and control cost on CWD testing and it will be near Poynette. An additional effort will be put towards informational kiosks and dumpsters for disposing of waste and they will continue to issue surveillance permits in the hotspot areas. There is a great amount of research being done not only in Wisconsin but all through the United States on CWD and its spread. On fisheries Lake Superior is starting to develop some statewide issues trying to stay on top of as we negotiated with the tribes and commercial fishing. We are also working with the division of Applied Science to improve the communication and flow of information from that department to all the divisions.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Information only. No action taken.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

F. Bear Management Plan

Scott Walter

DISCUSSION	<p>Scott started out by saying that the entire Bear Committee which was made up of Mike Rogers, the Bear Committee and 11 stakeholder groups really put the pedal to the metal over the seven meetings that they had to develop this plan. The past plan was 39 years old, approved in 1980 and it is interesting to note that some of the issues that were identified in 1980 are still some that we struggle with today. The new black bear hunting plan is designed to educate and engage people in black bear management. Currently estimated that we have three times the numbers of black bear today as we had in 1980. It is also noted that the range has expanded quite farther south. 46 out of 72 counties in the state have a recorded bear harvest. In the past (1980s) bear harvest was conducted simultaneously with the nine day deer season.</p>	
------------	---	--

WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes

Form 8300-026E (R 1/18)

Page 4 of 7

	<p>We have 10 times more people applying for bear harvest permits then we did in the 80s. We have many more scientific techniques to understand the dynamics involved with the bear harvest.</p> <p>He asked the committee to make sure its process was collaborative and transparent with no hidden goals or objectives. Here are some of the highlights of the plan:</p> <p>recommending the change in the zone structure along with adding an additional zone.</p> <p>Some of the boundaries have changed.</p> <p>It will move away from numeric population calls within the zones and embrace more of the social issues resulting from an abundance of bears. The harvest goals would reflect trends in areas such as ag damage, nuisance reports, health issues, and overcrowding. This would allow us to maintain a bear ecological goal.</p> <p>We would develop specific zone population goals to manage carrying capacity in zones A through E. In zone F that has more agriculture than bear habitat we would need to adjust the plan in coordination with amide ports.</p> <p>We explored and utilized best population modeling techniques.</p> <p>Addressed nuisance and ag damage issues.</p> <p>Did extensive public outreach with farmers and landowners.</p> <p>Note: the complete bear management plan is available on the DNR website.</p> <p>Larry requested a motion on approval of the bear management plan with exception for two items that were before the body of the convention. Item 1 the use of chocolate for bait, item 2 use of dogs for zone C.</p>
ACTION	Motion by Gunderson second by Rogers to accept the bear plan except for the two issues noted above which will go before the entire Congress delegation tomorrow from the convention floor. Motion carried.
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

G. Review County Dear Advisory Council's final recommendations

Jeff Pritzl

DISCUSSION	<p>I wanted to thank all the committees for the professional manner that they used in conducting their meetings and negotiating through some difficult issues. While not all counties are in agreement with the departmental plan honest civil discussion was still able to be maintained.</p> <p>Jeff stated that the results from the first meeting in March showed a recommendation three counties asking for buck only, 35 counties requesting a holiday hunt and 27 counties recommending the extended hunt going into Jan. During this time many of the concerns were raised about the winter severity index and its impact on the heard. Last winter was unusual in the way that the majority of the brutally cold than slick conditions were packed into a six week time frame, even though there was considerable snow pack and it took a long time to melt off because of the unusual timing the severity impact was minimal.</p> <p>After the April meetings the final tally resulted in zero counties requesting buck only, 29 counties recommending a holiday hunt and 22 recommending the extended hunt. There is some fluctuation in the number of free doe tags throughout the state some Metro units have issued up to three tags. The department recommends approval of 70 of the 72 County recommendations the two counties that are not in agreement on are Buffalo County, which recommended an antlerless only season and Monroe County, which had concerns about some of the quotas depending upon the quotas requested for the forest area within.</p> <p>Larry asked for a motion to approve the department recommendations for the 70 counties that we are in agreement on and deal with the two counties in question tomorrow at the convention.</p>
ACTION	<p>Motion by Gunderson second by Budnick to approve the department recommendations with the two exceptions. Kevin Smaby asked if those two counties would have the option to talk about their rejected positions? Larry stated that the motion was for the 70 counties that did have their proposals recommended by the department and that they would certainly have time to address their concerns.</p> <p>Jeff mentioned that both counties were contacted prior to the action of the department and the counties were aware of the decision.</p> <p>Terry stated that Buffalo County CDAC was well aware of their controversial position, but the fact of the matter is they felt they were out of tools and are very frustrated. It was also noted that 11 counties had requested more tools within their recommendation discussions, those included recommendations for a modified version of earn a buck or some other creative way of reducing the herd in a very controversial area.</p> <p>Larry stated that yes we are hearing from many CDAC's on the need for more tools, there is a need to find other tools outside of earn a buck and that the use of QDM and EAB will penalize those counties that are managing property correctly. Terry said this shows the need for better communication and education.</p> <p>Joel Taylor stated that when we first started into the CDAC program five years ago there was a discussion about having some type of tool similar to earn a buck and here we are five years down the road and still do not have enough tools for some of the counties. In many of the counties CDAC is working very well but in the last five years we've had any number of counties that have had issues that are covered under the current toolbox. He's afraid that very shortly we're going to get to a tipping point and lose control of some of the county herds. He feels that we need to be more aggressive on pushing for alternate tools to address these issues.</p> <p>Joe Weiss mentioned that in some counties it maybe advantageous in splitting the county, he realizes that this is not part of the main structure but may be another opportunity tool.</p> <p>We just reviewed the proposed bear management plan and it really jumped out at me that boundary lines were changed and they</p>

WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes

Form 8300-026E (R 1/18)

Page 5 of 7

<p>went by the county terrain. That recognition is a very important management tool.</p> <p>Mike Riggle stated that one thing was very clear with the formation of CDAC is that one tool cannot be applied statewide. We need to get over the idea that 72 counties cannot come up with unique management tools pertinent to their area, until we do that we will continue to have difficulties.</p> <p>There being no further discussion the action on the motion was called. Motion carried.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Roles of Historian and Outreach and Public Relations Coordinator positions on Executive

Dale Maas

H. Committee

DISCUSSION	<p>You've heard the presentation by Terry and the Outreach Committee as to what needs to be done and I thought it would be the best place to have this discussion, just to review where we are and whether it was reasonable to make adjustments.</p> <p>Back when we added the two positions to the executive committee, the intent was to broaden out the workload and keep us from having difficulty with the open meeting law. If two people road to a meeting together and there were only three people on the executive committee you basically had a rolling quorum. The titles were for the most part added to the positions after the fact and our concern is that we may not have the best individuals at all times elected to the positions and that's not to demean anybody that currently holds those positions. This has nothing to do with the individuals that have the position right now. I talked to Joe as the historian and one of the main things that we added to the work duties was the following of resolutions and the tracking of them. We're now in the process of finishing up a program to computerize all future resolutions and work on going back as far as we can with the those that are hand written.</p> <p>When we originally floated the idea of adding two people, the discussion was if we did that we can call it an at-large position. All I'm asking is that does it make sense to continue the way we are limiting the people that are willing to run for a job that may be very good at leadership but may not have public relations or writing ability high on their list of things that they want to do. It doesn't hurt to have those positions have oversight, but it doesn't necessarily mean that that's the only thing they do. Quite honestly everybody serves at the privilege of the chair when it comes to assignments.</p> <p>Tony Blattler stated that at the Strategic Planning meeting as we were going through the plan, which called out the two at-large positions.</p> <p>Mike Riggle commented that in the past the person that was on the executive committee representing Outreach and Public Relations was a writer and it was a natural opportunity for the Congress to utilize that expertise. But wouldn't it be better to have somebody serving that committee that truly was the most qualified person and that's not to say that Joel isn't. We could let the position on the executive committee have oversight but allow the most talented people that have an interest to be on the executive committee even if they may not have writing talent. Utilized those that have that talent on the committee. Another thing is the at-large person could continue to help share the load. Larry likes to go to every committee meeting and I think that that is ridiculous, the at-large people can help fill in. He believes that there are duties that can be divided up.</p> <p>Joe would like to see a list of other duties that at-large people could be assigned to do, he feels that that would be very helpful.</p> <p>Tony stated that we were getting away from the sole purpose of this discussion and that was that the committee was aware that no one person could track resolutions it would be a full-time staff position and we don't have it. As the electronic tracking part will definitely improve and make this an easier function once the prototype has been perfected. Please don't think that we are finding fault with either one of the positions we are trying to expand on and discover what other things could be shared.</p> <p>Larry asked if you think this is something that should go to the Strategic Plan Review Committee or maybe the Rules and Resolutions Committee?</p> <p>Terry stated that in her report where we talk about structural review, this would fit in very nicely and who would work on it.</p> <p>Tony said that the rules and resolutions committee had already discussed this and was asking for direction on how to proceed.</p> <p>Mike Riggle stated that the primary duties of these two positions is to expand the executive committee and enhance that opportunity and to say that you are assigned this and you will be assigned that. If it's out of your area of expertise does not make sense. Rather than compartmentalize all of these duties make it a little bit more general allow the chair to have the privilege of making assignments which happens throughout the year and not box it into a tiny compartment that this person can only do this, this person can only do that.</p> <p>Tony stated that verbiage is already in the code of procedure to authorize positions to work at the items assigned by the chair.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Motion by Riggle second by Weir to send to Rules and Resolutions committee for appropriate wording. Motion carried.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

I. Outreach on WCC social media by committee leadership

Tony Blattler

DISCUSSION	<p>As we heard in previous discussions this is part of what the Outreach Committee recommended. This would require a Code of Procedure change to require two submissions to social media one prior to any committee meeting and one as a follow-up.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Motion by Roehrig second by Weir to make a Code of Procedure change to require each committee chair or vice chair or secretary to submit to social media once prior to the meeting of the committee and the second to be a follow-up after the meeting. Motion carried.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

J. Review of Strategic Plan Implementation Committee Report

Terry Roehrig

DISCUSSION	<p>Terry presented a PowerPoint presentation, updating the DLC on some of the past actions. She thanked the committee who worked very diligently on the review of the Strategic Plan process. As reported earlier the committee reviewed each of the strategic plan goals and strategies. The goal status review resulted in 21 strategies identified, four of which were completed (19%) six did not complete (29%) and 11 started an ongoing (52%) which yielded a total of 71% that were started. She referred to the recommendations made at the January DLC meeting that yielded the following: current strategic planning process is not the best use of time for this volunteer organization and the committee is therefore recommending a different approach. Change what we call it to WCC planning goals so it is more meaningful to our delegates. Identifying long-term goals and annual review. And charged with creation of yearly goals (short-term and long-term). This was approved when presented to the committee in the January meeting. In order to and in moving forward the following parameters and definitions were established: short-term are goals that we will action and complete within one year.</p> <p>Ongoing (long-term) are goals that take longer than one year to complete or and are ongoing goal with no end.</p> <p>Measurement will be the evaluation and assessment of progress to complete within a time frame that strategic planning goals, one from convention for the goals to be action and evaluated.</p> <p>Long-term goals: nine reach, communication improvements, County Conservation Alliance creation and support, WCC support, delegate recruitment, education program to youth groups and education trailers and support.</p> <p>Funding for the following: a stenographer to record appropriate meetings, support the WCC mission, support Wisconsin Natural Resources and participate in support in the Wisconsin coalition of clean water and healthy soil.</p> <p>Procedural: improve convention agenda, the order of speakers and presenters, risen resolutions on Friday and move the convention around the state. Continue to improve online participation and adjust plan to newly elected political leadership.</p> <p>Recruitment: delegate recruitment, spring hearing participation and WCC.</p> <p>WCC organizational structure: structure should have an annual review and measure effectiveness of the operation including two at-large positions (historian and outreach) along with additional goal measuring process and tracking including resolutions.</p> <p>Short-term goals as far as outreach: the following measurement was suggested were, DNR and advisory committee meetings required to post per meeting by the chair, vice chair or secretary. The first post could be the meeting announcement/event creation and the second post would be an overview/highlights from the meeting. Another area was the number of social media submissions each month. Increase request for the use of the trailers. Increase the money/funding for the trailers. Increase the number of mounts for trailers. Increase advertising for trailers. Asked for money to sponsor and on Facebook for spring hearings. And ask friends of WCC to support social media. She stated nothing else matters, if we cannot reach more people! She summarizes the presentation and saying that the goals are straightforward, are meaningful, are attainable, applied both delegate and committees, and we have a report card to help us measure ourselves which is the annual review. She asked what we will do to commit to these goals on a personal level and as a delegate and representative of the WCC? She asked what will you do to be the change that is needed in this organization to continue to grow and reach a greater number of people in Wisconsin? Talk to your DLC about your commitment and your desire to make an impact.</p> <p>Larry stated that this would be brought up tomorrow at the state convention and thanked Terry and the committee for their effort.</p>	
ACTION	Information only action to be taken at the convention.	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

III. MEMBERS MATTERS

DISCUSSION	<p>Kevin Smaby suggested that we need to form a CWD committee and make it separate from the committee.</p> <p>Ken Risley stated the DNR should do more on publicizing CDAC and the opportunity to input comments. Joe Weiss asked how we weigh the online versus those that attended when we vote on issues tomorrow at the convention? Larry stated that Kari has a presentation for tomorrow early on in the convention that will explain that.</p> <p>Bob Heisley asked how many people looked at the WCC Facebook page in the last week? How many people know how it functions? He felt that a breakout workshop would be beneficial in the future.</p> <p>Stan Brownell attended a CWD task force in Monroe County and wondered does the WCC have any difficulties in being part of this structure? Larry stated that we have defined positions on CWD and as long as representation follows those guidelines if you're exercising your rights as a WCC delegate that would be fine. If you're acting on your own you need to make sure that this is a personal opinion and not a WCC position.</p> <p>Dave Larson said it was good to see the push on clean water and hoped his County will add additional staff.</p> <p>Tony Blattner noted that some committees of the Congress do not meet annually and this should be clarified in the Code of Procedure.</p> <p>Larry Bonde notified the DLC that if elected he would serve one more year as WCC chair.</p>	
ACTION	Motion by Weiss second by Larson to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.	

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ADJOURNED	5:45 PM
-------------------	---------

WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes

Form 8300-026E (R 1/18)

Page 7 of 7

SUBMITTED BY	Dale C Maas
DATE	06/01/2019